

## **REMARKS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 15 and 24, rejected claims 1-2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 26 under 35 USC §102, and rejected claims 3, 10, 13, 14, 16, 20, 23-25 and 27-38. These objections and rejections are fully traversed below.

Claims 1, 15, 16 and 24 have been amended to correct minor informalities and/or to further clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. In addition, new claims 39-42 have been added to the application. Claims 1-42 are now pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

### **OBJECTION OF THE CLAIMS**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 15 and 24 due to informalities. Claims 15 and 24 have been amended to correct the informalities identified by the Examiner. Hence, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 15 and 24.

### **PATENTABILITY OF CLAIMS 1-38**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11, 12, 15, 17-19, 21, 22 and 26 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Kent ("The Complete Idiot's Guide to the Internet", Seventh Edition, 2001); rejected claims 3, 13, 14, 16, 23-25, 27-31 and 33-35 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent in view of Griner et al. (U.S. Patent 6,614,729); rejected claims 10 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent in view of Book et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0223566); rejected claim 32 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent in view of Griner et al. and Book et al.; rejected claims 36 and 37 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent in view of Griner et al. and Kronick ("Netscape Navigator Handbook", 1996); rejected claim 38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kent in view of Griner et al. and Buswell et al. (U.S. Patent 6,836,885). These rejections are fully traversed below.

The Examiner relies on Chapter 19 of Kent which describes downloading of files, namely, use of File Transfer Protocol (FTP) to download files from the Internet.

In contrast, the claimed invention pertains to techniques for sharing data with other application programs. The techniques allow data sharing between different application programs on a computer system. For example, a second application program can access data provided by a first application program without requiring the first application program to be executing or

running on the computer system. In one embodiment, an application program operates to publish its data for external use by other application programs. The data is, for example, database data maintained by the application program. The data can be published for external use by producing a data communication file that contains at least a portion of the data. In one implementation, the data communication file contains the data being published for external use in a markup language representation.

Claim 1 pertains to a method for sharing media data between application programs operating on at least one computer system. The method, among other things, recites “accessing, by a second application program, a data communication file provided by a first application program, the first application program utilizing database data, and the data communication file being derived from the database data” (claim 1, lines 4-7). In addition, the method of claim 1 recites “producing a user interface on the display using data internal to the data communication file;” (claim 1, lines 8-9).

In the Office Action, the Examiner points to page 267, lines 1-2 of Kent as corresponding to the accessing operation of claim 1. However, page 267, lines 1-2 of Kent merely indicates that a directory link can be clicked-on to display another Web document that shows the contents of that directory. Further, as to the producing operation in which a user interface is produced using data from the data communication file, the Examiner points to Figure 19.1 on page 267 of Kent. The Figure 19.1 merely depicts a browser window displaying a FTP site.

As clarified, claim 1 specifies that a first application program utilizes database data, and the data communication file being provided by the first application program is derived from the database data. Hence, the data communication file is a specific type of electronic file that is produced to exchange media data between different application programs. Often, database data is provided in a proprietary format and thus not typically usable by other application programs. Hence, by providing the data communication file, these different application programs are able to share the database data.

In addition, as noted above, the method of claim 1 recites that a user interface is produced on the display screen using data internal to the data communication file. Here, the data communication file is accessed such that the data internal thereto is utilized in producing the user interface that is displayed. There is nothing in Kent that teaches or suggests that any of the files being transferred using FTP would be accessed to utilize their internal data. Hence, the transfer of electronic files over the Internet using the FTP protocol as disclosed in Kent is not a means for

sharing data between application programs as recited in claim 1. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinct from Kent.

Claim 15 pertains to a computer readable medium that includes at least computer program code for sharing media data between application programs. Among other things, claim 15 recites “computer program code for accessing, by a second application program, a data communication file automatically produced and provided by a first application program;” (claim 15, lines 4-6). Here, the computer program code operated by a second application program accesses a data communication file that has been automatically produced and provided by a first application program. By doing so, the second application program gains access to the data in the data communication file that was provided by the first application program. In other words, data, namely, media data, can be shared between the different application programs. There is nothing in Kent that teaches or suggests use of a data communication file that was automatically produced by one application program so that another application program is able to access the data in the data communication file. Accordingly, it is noted that Kent fails to teach or suggest the computer readable medium recited in claim 15.

Claim 27 pertains to a computer system for sharing media data between application programs operating thereon. Here, the computer system includes a first application program, a data storage device, and a second application program. Here, both the first application program and a second application program operate on the same computer system. Hence, the FTP described in Kent would not be usable in such an environment. Accordingly, it is submitted that Kent fails to teach or suggest the computer readable medium recited in claim 27.

In rejecting certain dependent claims, the Examiner relies on Greiner et al., Book et al. and or Buswell et al. to overcome certain deficiencies of Kent. However, none of the secondary references overcome the deficiencies noted above regarding Kent. Hence, even if one or more of the secondary references were combinable with Kent, the combination would still fail to teach or suggest any of claims 1, 15 or 27.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 15 and 27 are patentably distinct from Kent, alone or in combination with Greiner et al., Book et al. and/or Buswell et al. In addition, it is submitted that dependent claims 2-14, 16-26 and 28-38 are also patentably distinct for at least the same reasons. The additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed as the above-discussed limitations are clearly sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from Kent, Greiner et al., Book et al. and/or

Buswell et al. Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-38 under 35 USC §§ 102(b), 103(a).

### **SUMMARY**

It is submitted that claims 15 and 24 are no longer objectionable. In addition, it is submitted that claims 1-38 (as well as new claims 39-42) are patentably distinct from the cited references. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0388 (Order No. APL1P288).

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



C. Douglass Thomas  
Reg. No. 32,947

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
(650) 961-8300